

**Appln No. 10/079,293**

**Amdt date August 18, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of May 18, 2004**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed on May 18, 2004. Claim 28 has been amended. Claims 42 and 43 have been added. Claims 9-17 and 20-43 are now pending in this application. Reconsideration on the basis of the above amendments and remarks below is kindly requested.

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephonic conference on July 20, 2004, wherein the disclosure of the above-referenced application was discussed.

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40 and 41 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner specifically stated that the rejected claims call for a hard material body that has an end surface comprising a canted portion extending to the periphery and an uncanted portion extending to the periphery wherein the canted portion intersects the periphery along a periphery line and wherein the entire periphery line extends along the plane. Such an embodiment, according to the Examiner is not described in the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The application as originally filed, discloses for example on Figure 9B, a cutting element having a substrate having a canted portion and an uncanted portion and ultra hard material over both the canted and uncanted portions. Moreover, Figures 10A to 10D disclose cutting elements wherein only a portion of

**Appln No. 10/079,293**

**Amdt date August 18, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of May 18, 2004**

the substrate end surfaces are canted. Although Figures 9B and 10A-10D disclose that the canted portions of the end surfaces which are canted are non-planar, the specification is clear that the canted end surface can have various shapes. For example, on page 2, lines 24-26 it is stated that "the canted end face of the cutter can be planar, curved both in a convex or concave fashion, may be stepped and may be non-uniform in cross-section." As such, the canted end surface shown in Figure 9B which is curved in a concave fashion may also be planar. Similar remarks are made on page 6, lines 14 to 29. Furthermore, the application on page 7, lines 11-12 states that "the canted interface itself maybe non-uniform in cross-section. . ." referring to the interfaces shown in Figures 9A to 9F. This statement implies that the canted interface may also be uniform. Thus, support for the subject matter of the rejected claims is found in the application as originally filed. Consequently, applicant submits that the rejections to these claims should now be withdrawn.

Claims 42 and 43 have been added and are directed to subject matter disclosed in the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Claim 28 has been amended for clarity. The specification has also been amended for clarity.

The rejections and objections to all claims pending in this application are believed to have been overcome and this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns about the allowability of this application, the Examiner is

Appln No. 10/079,293  
Amdt date August 18, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 18, 2004

kindly requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss  
them.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Constantine Marantidis  
Reg. No. 39,759  
626/795-9900

CM/cmt  
CMT PAS577708.1-\* -08/18/04 12:47 PM